

HEXASEPALUM TERES (RUBIACEAE), A NEW COMBINATION

Joseph H. Kirkbride, Jr.

USDA-ARS, U.S. National Arboretum
Floral & Nursery Plants Research Unit
3501 New York Avenue NE
Washington, DC 20002-1958, U.S.A.
joseph.kirkbride@ars.usda.gov

ABSTRACT

The new combination **Hexasepalum teres** (Rubiaceae) is made for a widespread, New World species distributed from the eastern U.S.A. to Bolivia and Paraguay.

RESUMEN

La nueva combinación **Hexasepalum teres** (Rubiaceae) está hecha para una especie que está ampliamente difundida en el Nuevo Mundo, y distribuida desde el este de los EE.UU. hasta Bolivia y Paraguay.

Small (1913) described the genus *Diodella* Small as a segregate from the genus *Diodia* L. and transferred a single species name into the genus as *Diodella rigida* (Cham. & Schltdl.) Small. Later in the year (Small & Carter 1913) he transferred a second species, as *Diodella teres* (Walter) Small. For the next 85 years, *Diodella* was treated as a junior synonym of the genus *Diodia*. In 1999 Bacigalupo and Cabral revised the genus *Diodia* for the Americas. They treated *Diodia* in a very narrow sense, reducing it to five species, and suggested that 16 species then included in *Diodia* belonged to the genus *Diodella* without making the necessary new combinations. Over the last 14 years most of the new combinations in the genus *Diodella* have been made by various authors.

Recently Cabaña Fader et al. (2012) discovered that *Diodella* and *Hexasepalum* Bartl. ex DC. (1830) are generic synonyms. They proposed that *Hexasepalum* and its single species, *H. angustifolium* Bartl. ex DC., be rejected. They argued that since *Hexasepalum* is older than *Diodella*, the 16 species of *Diodella* would have to be transferred to *Hexasepalum*, which would cause significant nomenclatural disruption. The Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants (Applequist 2013) did not recommend rejection of *Hexasepalum* and *H. angustifolium*. The Committee felt that since most usage of the name *Diodella* has only been in the last decade, adoption of the name *Hexasepalum* would not cause excessive nomenclatural disruption.

The taxon known as *Diodia teres* Walter or *Diodella teres* occurs in North America, north of Mexico. For the *Flora of North America*, I will treat it in a genus distinct from *Diodia*, thus it is necessary to transfer the specific epithet of *Diodia teres* into the genus *Hexasepalum*.

RESULTS

Hexasepalum teres (Walter) J.H. Kirkbr., comb. nov. BASIONYM: *Diodia teres* Walter, Fl. carol. 87. 1788. TYPE: UNITED STATES. SOUTH CAROLINA: Georgetown Co.: Georgetown, old field, 24 Aug 1939, R.K. Godfrey & R.M. Tryon 1682 (NEOTYPE, designated by Ward 2008:476; GH00277018; ISONEOTYPES: NY1163926! US1838313!).

Distribution.—Native: United States (Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin), Mexico, Cuba, Hispaniola, Jamaica, Margarita, Belize, Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, Colombia, Venezuela, Guyana, Surinam, French Guiana, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Brazil, Paraguay; introduced: Netherlands, Cape Verde, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Senegal, Angola, southeast China, Japan, Korea.

Fernald and Griscom (1937) discussed *Diodia teres* in the eastern United States and published three new varieties in the species. They presented the following, “Mr. C.A. Weatherby, upon looking for Walter’s type, reports that there is no Walter material of it in his herbarium at the British Museum; but he found in Paris that the type of *Spermacoce diodina* Michx., commonly referred to it, is the common and well known weed with fruits 2.9–3.6 mm long, covered with short appressed hairs ... and greatly exceeded by the stipules, and the leaves without prominently setiform tips. Since the latter plant is common all the way from Florida to New Jersey we are selecting it to stand as typical of Walter’s species.” Various authors (Steyermark 1972:798; Delprete 2010:371) have interpreted Fernald and Griscom’s text as a neotypification of *Diodia teres* on the Michaux specimen of *Spermacoce diodina* in the Michaux herbarium at P. This is based on a misapplication of Art. 7.10 of the ICN (McNeill et al. 2012), which states “designation of a type is achieved only ... if the type element is clearly indicated by direct citation including the term “type” (typus) or an equivalent ...” The word “typical” in the last sentence has been interpreted as an equivalent of “type” in the nomenclatural sense, but it is actually used in the sense of the species *S. diodina* being representative of the species *Diodia teres*. Since “typical” was not used in the sense of the word “type,” i.e. a single specimen, this was not a neotypification of *Diodia teres*.

Steyermark (1972:798) cited the collection locality of Michaux’s specimen as the type of *Diodia teres*, but as he did not clearly indicate the type element, as required by Art. 7.10 (McNeill et al. 2012) for an existing name, he did not achieve typification. This interpretation is consistent with Art. 40, Note 2 for new names, where citation of a collection locality without the collector’s name, collection number, or date would not be adequate for typification. In citing the collectors’ name and number, the collection locality and date, and the herbarium in which the specimen is deposited, Ward (2008) effectively neotypified the species.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank John Wiersema, USDA-ARS National Germplasm Resources Laboratory, Beltsville, Maryland for his nomenclatural help and review of the manuscript. Steven P. Darwin (NO) and David H. Lorence (PTBG) provided helpful reviews.

REFERENCES

- APPLEQUIST, W.L. 2013. Report of the nomenclature committee for vascular plants: 65. *Taxon* 62:1315–1326.
- BACIGALUPO, N.M. & E.L. CABRAL. 1999. Revisión de las especies americanas del género *Diodia* (Rubiaceae, Spermacoceae). *Darwiniana* 37:153–165.
- CABAÑA FADER, A.A., R.M. SALAS, & E.L. CABRAL. 2012. (2114–2115) Proposals to reject the names *Hexasepalum* and *H. angustifolium* (Rubiaceae). *Taxon* 61:1333–1334.
- CANDOLLE, A.P. DE. 1830. CLXXVI. *Hexasepalum* Bartl. in H. Haenke. *Prodr.* 4:561. Treuttel et Würtz, Paris. France.
- DELPRETE, P.G. 2010. Rubiaceae, parte 1: Introdução, gêneros A–H. In: J.Á. Rizzo, ed. *Flora dos Estados de Goiás e Tocantins*. Universidade Federal de Goiás, Goiânia, Brazil. 40:1–580.
- FERNALD, M.L. & L. GRISCOM. 1937. III. Notes on *Diodia*. *Rhodora* 39:306–308.
- MCNEILL, J., F.R. BARRIE, W.R. BUCK, V. DEMOULIN, W. GREUTER, D.L. HAWKSWORTH, P.S. HERENDEN, S. KNAPP, K. MARHOLD, J. PRADO, W.F. PRUD’HOMME VAN REINE, G.F. SMITH, J.H. WIERSEMA, & N.J. TURLAND. 2012. International code of nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants (Melbourne Code). Koeltz Scientific Books, Königstein.
- SMALL, J.K. 1913. *Flora of Miami*. J.K. Small, New York, U.S.A.
- SMALL, J.K. & J.J. CARTER. 1913. *Flora of Lancaster County*. J.K. Small and J.J. Carter, New York, U.S.A.
- STEYERMARK, J.A. 1972. 38. *Diodia* (Gronovius) ex Linnaeus. *Mem. New York Bot. Gard.* 23:788–805.
- WARD, D.B. 2008. Thomas Walter typification project, V: neotypes and epitypes for 63 Walter names of genera D through Z. *J. Bot. Res. Inst. Texas* 2:475–486.